



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/577,311	05/23/2000	Philip E. Chalberg	CHALB-86	4757

1054 7590 05/16/2002

LEONARD TACHNER, A PROFESSIONAL LAW
CORPORATION
17961 SKY PARK CIRCLE, SUITE 38-E
IRVINE, CA 92614

EXAMINER

MARSH, STEVEN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3632

DATE MAILED: 05/16/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/577,311

Applicant(s)

CHALBERG ET AL.

Examiner

Steven M Marsh

Art Unit

3632

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 February 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This is the second office action for US Application 09/577,311 for a Method and Apparatus for Mounting an Electric Water Pump filed by Philip E. Chalberg et al. on May 23, 2000.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 4,033,531 to Levine in view of U.S. Patent 4,339,102 to Schweitzer.

Claims 1-3, 5-8, and 11-13 are rejected because Levine discloses an apparatus for holding an electric motor-operated device which has a stand (18) having a support plate (24) and a slotted plate (26) which are integral to one another. The slotted plate extends perpendicular to the support plate and is affixed to the support plate. The slotted plate has a plurality of elongated slots (30) at selected space-apart locations with some slots being located further from the support plate than other slots. The apparatus also comprises an electric motor-operated device (10) which has spaced apart mounting plates (28) and can be positioned in a direction perpendicular to the support plate.

Art Unit: 3632

Levine does not disclose hooks extending from the mounting plate of the electric motor for insertion through the slots of the stand. Schweitzer discloses a jar mounting device for mounting a jar to a preforated board support in a cantilevered state. The device (14) can be positioned in different locations along a preforated board (10) by inserting a set of hooks (30 and 33) through a selected aperture (12) along the board. The electric motor and mounting plate (28) taught by Levine are supported by bolts extending from the mounting plate and through the slots of the stand (18), rather than hooks. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to have supported the mounting plate with hooks, as taught by Schweitzer, rather than bolts, as taught by Levine, for the purpose of providing a support stand which allows the apparatus to be repositioned without the use of tools. It also would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to eliminate the second bracket (20) taught by Levine after substituting a pair of hooks for the bolts of the support, as taught by Schweitzer, thereby resulting in a motor supported in a cantilevered state, for the purpose of conserving material,

Levine also fails to disclose four columns of slots in the slotted plate, whereby a first pair of columns are spaced from each other the same distance that a second pair of columns are spaced from each other. The jar mounting apparatus taught by Schweitzer has at least four columns of apertures, wherein a first pair of columns is spaced from each other the same distance as a second pair of columns. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to have provided

Art Unit: 3632

additional columns (at least 4 total) of elongated slots on the slotted plate taught by Levine, as taught by Schweitzer, for the purpose of providing the motor a plurality of locations at which it could be supported.

Claim 4 is also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levine in view of Schweitzer. Levine in view of Schweitzer does not specifically disclose an apparatus for holding and positioning an electric water pump. However, column 1, line 7 reads, "This invention relates generally to devices for mounting various equipment, such as electric motors, refrigerant tanks, and the like". This would appear to anticipate an electric water pump and therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to use an electric water pump rather than an electric motor.

Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levine. Levine discloses a stand (18) that can be formed by bending a unitary planar member to provide a support plate (24) and an attachment plate (26) which is substantially perpendicular to the support plate. There are a plurality of mating elements (30) in the attachment plate and the stand could be placed adjacent to a tub wall with the attachment plate parallel to the tub wall. There is a second mating element (32) that is integral to the motor 10 (by way of the mounting plate 28) that is mated with the first mating element.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed February 25, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Levine does not disclose selective positioning or a cantilevered apparatus. Levine does not disclose either feature, however, Schweitzer does disclose both selective positioning for an apparatus, as well as a cantilevered apparatus. It would be obvious to provide two pairs of columns on the slotted plate taught by Levine, rather than two columns, to provide selective positioning for an object. It would also be obvious to allow an object to be supported from one side, as taught by Schweitzer, for the purpose of minimizing the number of parts necessary to support it.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of


Art Unit: 3632

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven Marsh whose telephone number is (703) 305-0098. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00AM to 4:30 PM. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-2168. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-3597.


Steven Marsh

May 14, 2002


LESLIE A. BRAUN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER